

**DIEMER & WEI, LLP**

Kathryn S. Diemer (#133977)  
55 S Market Street, Suite 1420  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Telephone: 408-971-6270  
Facsimile: 408-971-6271  
Email: kdiemer@diemerwei.com

**WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP**

Matthew A. Feldman (*pro hac vice*)  
Joseph G. Minias (*pro hac vice*)  
Benjamin P. McCallen (*pro hac vice*)  
Daniel I. Forman (*pro hac vice*)  
787 Seventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10019-6099  
Telephone: (212) 728-8000  
Facsimile: (212) 728-8111  
Email: mfeldman@willkie.com  
jminias@willkie.com  
bmccallen@willkie.com  
dforman@willkie.com

*Counsel for Ad Hoc Group of Subrogation Claim Holders*

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

**In re:**

**PG&E CORPORATION,**

**-and-**

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
COMPANY,  
Debtors.**

- ☐ Affects PG&E Corporation  
☐ Affects Pacific Gas and Electric  
Company  
☒ Affects both Debtors

*\* All papers shall be filed in the lead case,  
No. 19-30088 (DM)*

Chapter 11  
Bankr. Case No. 19-30088 (DM)  
(Jointly Administered)

**THE AD HOC GROUP OF SUBROGATION  
CLAIM HOLDERS' OMNIBUS REPLY TO  
PLAN CONFIRMATION OBJECTIONS**

Date: May 27, 2020  
Time: 10:00 a.m. (PT)  
Place: United States Bankruptcy Court  
Courtroom 17, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102

1 The Ad Hoc Group of Subrogation Claim Holders (the “**Ad Hoc Subrogation**  
2 **Group**”) in the above-captioned chapter 11 cases of PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric  
3 Company (collectively, the “**Debtors**”), by its attorneys Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP and Diemer  
4 & Wei, LLP, hereby submits this reply (the “**Reply**”) to certain objections to confirmation of the  
5 Plan (collectively, the “**Objections**”).<sup>1</sup> In support of this Reply, the Ad Hoc Subrogation Group  
6 respectfully represents as follows:

7 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

8 Since these chapter 11 cases began sixteen months ago, the parties in interest have  
9 worked tirelessly to negotiate a confirmable plan of reorganization supported by all major stakeholder  
10 constituencies, but especially victims of the devastating 2017 and 2018 Northern California wildfires.  
11 These efforts have not been in vain. After months of litigation in multiple courtrooms, countless  
12 hours of mediation, and hard-fought negotiations, the Debtors and Shareholder Proponents begin the  
13 confirmation proceedings with a plan of reorganization that is overwhelmingly supported by the  
14 Debtors’ constituents and satisfies the confirmation requirements of 11 U.S.C. § 1129.

15 The tenor of these chapter 11 cases was very different less than a year ago in the  
16 summer of 2019. In early July, the Ad Hoc Subrogation Group and Official Committee of Tort  
17 Claimants (“**TCC**”) filed motions seeking to lift the automatic stay so that a California jury could  
18 determine the Debtors’ liability for the devastating 2017 Tubbs Fire. Also in July, the Debtors moved  
19 to estimate billions of dollars in liability for wildfire claims in expedited proceedings pursuant to 11  
20 U.S.C. § 502(c), which ultimately were withdrawn to the District Court. Subsequently, the Ad Hoc  
21 Subrogation Group and a group of the Debtors’ noteholders separately moved to terminate the  
22 Debtors’ exclusive right to file a proposed plan of reorganization, and thus eliminate the Debtors’  
23 exclusive control over the plan process. These motions and proceedings along with the June 30, 2020  
24 plan confirmation deadline imposed by A.B. 1054 placed considerable pressure on the Debtors and  
25 interested parties to make progress quickly.

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Capitalized terms used but not defined shall have the meanings ascribed in the *Debtors’ and Shareholder*  
28 *Proponents’ Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization Dated March 16, 2020* (the “**Plan**”) [Docket No. 6320].

1 The Debtors and Ad Hoc Subrogation Group worked around the clock to achieve a  
2 prompt compromise, negotiating and executing the Subrogation Claims RSA, one of the cornerstones  
3 of the current Plan. The Subrogation Claims RSA resolved over \$20 billion in potential unsecured  
4 claims, arising from over \$15 billion of payments that Ad Hoc Subrogation Group members had  
5 already made to insured victims of the 2017 and 2018 wildfires, and billions more in reserves on  
6 account of potential future payments to insureds, and fees and interest. The Subrogation Claims RSA  
7 settled those claims at a steep discount in exchange for an aggregate \$11 billion allowed claim, which  
8 would be paid in cash under the Debtors' plan. This steeply-discounted settlement helped ensure the  
9 Debtors' estates would remain solvent, all parties would get a fair settlement, and that the Debtors  
10 would meet the A.B. 1054 deadline.

11 The fairness of these settlements has not been lost on the actual holders of wildfire  
12 claims. The three classes of wildfire claims have voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Plan.<sup>2</sup> The  
13 tremendous support of the Plan is not surprising. In addition to culminating months of grueling effort  
14 on behalf of all parties, the Plan comfortably satisfies the Bankruptcy Code's Section 1129  
15 confirmation standards. Most critically, the Plan provides for the satisfaction of the claims of  
16 individual wildfire victims, many of whom have suffered unimaginable tragedies, in a manner that  
17 has the overwhelming support of that class. While the TCC has objected to certain aspects of the  
18 Plan, that objection should be viewed in the context of an overwhelming majority of voting individual  
19 fire victims supporting the Plan. This Court should abide by the will of the Debtors' stakeholders,  
20 find the Section 1129 confirmation standards are satisfied, and confirm the Plan.

### 21 **ARGUMENT**

22 The Ad Hoc Subrogation Group joins in the Debtors' brief in support of confirmation,  
23 and addresses below five discrete issues raised in various Objections related to Subrogation Wildfire  
24 Claims. For the reasons set forth below and in the Debtors' brief in support of confirmation, the TCC  
25 Objection, and all other Objections relating to the Plan's treatment of Subrogation Wildfire Claims

---

26 <sup>2</sup> On May 18, the Debtors issued a press release stating that the preliminary voting results on the Plan indicated  
27 "overwhelming acceptance of the Plan by the wildfire victims entitled to vote on the Plan." See *PG&E Corporation*  
28 *Announces Preliminary Voting Results in Plan of Reorganization*, May 18, 2020.

1 or their holders are without merit and should be overruled.

2 A. The Definition Of Subrogation Wildfire Claim In The Plan Is Consistent With The RSAs

3 The TCC's Objection with respect to the definition of "Subrogation Wildfire Claim"  
4 is meritless. A blackline highlighting the change in the current definition of "Subrogation Wildfire  
5 Claim" was filed prior to the March 10 disclosure statement hearing. *See* Dkt. No. 6218.<sup>3</sup> The  
6 amended definition of which the TCC now complains was prompted by arguments it raised in its  
7 objection to claims filed by Adventist Health System ("**Adventist**"). *See* Dkt. No. 5760.  
8 Specifically, the TCC argued that Adventist – which is a victim and not an insurer – should recover  
9 from the Subrogation Wildfire Trust to the extent Adventist retained any rights to insurance proceeds.  
10 The TCC's view was that Adventist was somehow simultaneously pursuing its own claims and the  
11 subrogation claims of its own insurer. *See* Dkt. No. 5760 at \*6 ("Adventist Health may contend that  
12 it has an obligation to collect a distribution on its wildfire claim in the full amount of its wildfire  
13 losses, and then turn over the insurer's share of the distribution to the insurer, FM Global, in which  
14 Adventist Health may be a policyholder owner."). By the TCC's logic, this argument could  
15 presumably be applied to any other similarly situated fire victim with insurance, raising the threat of  
16 wholesale reclassification of creditors.

17 Of course, this was never the parties' understanding, and in fact the exact opposite was  
18 represented to the Court on multiple occasions when the TCC and other parties stated that Adventist  
19 was a Fire Victim that would recover from the Fire Victim Trust. *See* Dec. 17, 2019 Hr'g Tr. 152:4-  
20 22 (TCC counsel stating that Adventist would share in the TCC's settlement, and that to "the extent  
21 . . . the TCC did not include [Adventist] in the mediation process, . . . there was not any intent to  
22 leave Adventist out of a very difficult settlement"); *id.* 146:13-147:3 (counsel for Adventist stating  
23 without objection from the TCC that its claim would be against "the big trust" or "the thirteen-and-  
24

---

25 <sup>3</sup> The TCC should be precluded from objecting to the definition of "Subrogation Wildfire Claim" based on its  
26 failure to raise this issue prior to the approval of the Disclosure Statement. Despite the revised definition being filed on  
27 March 10, the TCC did not object to the clarification at the hearing later that day, or in the week following when the  
28 Debtors were finalizing the eventually approved Disclosure Statement. In fact, the TCC only objected to the definition of  
"Subrogation Wildfire Claim" in a letter sent to the Subrogation Group on March 24, a full ten days after the clarifying  
definition has been proposed and subsequently approved by the court.

1 a-half-billion-dollar trust”); *id.* 163:1-4 (counsel for the California government agencies likening  
2 their claims to Adventist, as another “very large claim[]” that is “going to be part of this fire victim  
3 trust.”). Even Adventist described the TCC’s position that Adventist’s claims “should be classified  
4 not as a Fire Victim Claim, but as a Subrogation Wildfire Claim” as “nonsense” because “[t]he  
5 Adventist Claimants are victims of the Debtors’ wrongdoing and seek to recover for their own  
6 injuries, [they are] not an insurer pressing a subrogation claim for amounts paid to its insured.” *See*  
7 Dkt. No. 6174 at \*9.

8           The change to the Plan’s definition of Subrogation Wildfire Claim simply clarified that  
9 Fire Victims, like Adventist, should assert their claims against the Fire Victim Trust, and insurers  
10 (and their assignees) should assert their claims against the Subrogation Trust. The clarifying change  
11 to the definition was critical to preventing the TCC from attempting to inappropriately shift billions  
12 of dollars in individual Fire Victim claims into the Subrogation Wildfire Trust. Thus, the relevant  
13 change in the definition was made in direct response to meritless arguments the TCC advanced in  
14 contravention of the clear terms of both the Subrogation Claims RSA and Tort Claimants RSA, the  
15 then-proposed Plan and prior statements to the Court. Ultimately, however, this Court need not  
16 address whether the definition of “Subrogation Wildfire Claim” approved in the Disclosure  
17 Statement contradicts the Tort Claimants RSA. The Ad Hoc Subrogation Group takes no issue with  
18 the TCC’s proposed solution to its own objection—*i.e.* approving the Fire Victim Trust’s right to set  
19 off insurance recoveries.<sup>4</sup>

20           Insurers will continue to honor their contractual obligations to their insureds, as they  
21 have since the moment the tragic wildfires first affected the Fire Victims. However, the TCC’s  
22 arguments that the “Subrogation RSA expressly provides for payment by the Debtors of insured  
23 claims that the Insurers have reserved for payment but have not yet paid,” and that the reserves  
24 “remain the legal obligation of the Insurers” *TCC Objection* at \*26, mischaracterize the Subrogation  
25

---

26 <sup>4</sup> The Ad Hoc Subrogation Group has reserved the rights of insurers with respect to a separate issue related to  
27 Fire Victim insurance and the Fire Victim Trust – and that is with respect to any purported assignment of Fire Victim’s  
28 entitlements to insurance proceeds, as further described in the reservation of rights the Ad Hoc Subrogation Group filed  
prior to the deadline to object to the Plan. *See* Dkt. No. 7258.

1 Claims RSA and misconstrue the meaning of reserves. The insurance reserves referenced in the  
2 Subrogation Claims RSA do not represent obligations to policyholders, as the TCC disingenuously  
3 suggests. Reserves are estimates of claims to be paid in the future. *See* Subrogation Claims RSA,  
4 Dkt. No. 296-3 Ex. A at 5 (defining Reserved Claims as “*projected* payments relating to Subrogation  
5 Claims reserved but not paid, as of the date of measurement”)(emphasis added); *see also Lipton v.*  
6 *Superior Court*, 48 Cal. App. 4th 1599, 1612-1613 (1996) (reserves “represent the amount anticipated  
7 to be sufficient to pay all obligations for which the insurer may be responsible under the policy with  
8 respect to a particular claim . . . a particular reserve amount may be substantially more or less than  
9 the amount ultimately paid on a particular claim.”). When and to the extent those reserves mature  
10 into claims that are due and owing, those claims will be paid, just as billions of dollars in claims have  
11 already been paid by insurers to fire victims.

12 B. The Classification Scheme in the Debtors’ Plan is Proper

13 Two objecting parties incorrectly argue that the Plan’s classification scheme—which  
14 separately classifies Subrogation Wildfire Claims, Fire Victim Claims and Public Entities Wildfire  
15 Claims—renders the Plan non-confirmable because it purportedly does not provide “the same  
16 treatment for each claim or interest of a particular class” under Section 1123(a)(4). *See* Dkt. No.  
17 7194; Dkt. No. 7316. Under Ninth Circuit law, plan proponents are given broad discretion to classify  
18 claims. *See In re City of Stockton, California*, 542 B.R. 261, 280 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 2015) (“Generally,  
19 § 1122 allows plan proponents broad discretion to classify claims and interests according to the  
20 particular facts and circumstances of each case.”). Courts have held that a plan of reorganization can  
21 separately classify different groups of unsecured creditors when there is a “legitimate business or  
22 economic reason” for doing so. *In re Barakat*, 99 F.3d 1520, 1526 (9th Cir. 1996).

23 Here, the special nature of Fire Victim Claims was recognized at the very start of these  
24 chapter 11 cases. The United States Trustee appointed a separate Official Tort Claimants Committee  
25 consisting solely of holders of Fire Victim Claims and their representatives to represent the interests  
26 of holders of such claims. No holder of Subrogation Wildfire Claims was included on that committee,  
27 and the holders of such claims have formed their own, separate Ad Hoc Group. Moreover, there are  
28

1 any number of legitimate reasons for the Debtors' decision to separately classify Subrogation  
2 Wildfire Claims from other classes of unsecured wildfire claims, including (i) that the Debtors have  
3 historically reached separate settlement agreements with subrogation claimholders, and (ii) the fact  
4 that the Subrogation Wildfire Claims arise from the unique legal doctrine of subrogation, which  
5 allows third parties (rather than the underlying injured party) to collect against a tortfeasor. Indeed,  
6 multiple courts have found that asserting subrogation rights alone may be reason enough to separately  
7 classify otherwise similar claims. *See, e.g. In re Chateaugay, Corp.*, 89 F.3d 942 (2d Cir. 1996)  
8 (affirming a bankruptcy court ruling to separately classify insurance subrogation claims based on  
9 paid workers' claims from the remaining unpaid workers' directly-asserted claims); *see also In re*  
10 *Montreal Maine & Atlantic Railway, Ltd.*, 2015 WL 7431192 (Bankr. D. Me. Oct. 9, 2015)  
11 (confirming a plan in which subrogation claims were separately classified); *In re Mesa Air Group,*  
12 *Inc.*, 2011 WL 182450 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Jan. 20, 2011) (same).

13 Because the Subrogation Wildfire Claims and Fire Victim Claims are permissibly  
14 separately classified, the relative treatment of those two separate classes is not governed by Section  
15 1123(a)(4)'s same treatment within a class requirement. The comparative treatment of creditors in  
16 separate classes of unsecured claims becomes an issue only when one of the two classes rejects the  
17 plan, in which event the "cram down" requirement of Section 1129(b)(1) that the plan "does not  
18 discriminate unfairly" with respect to the dissenting class comes into play. Since both classes  
19 (Subrogation Wildfire Claims and Fire Victim Claims) have accepted the Plan (and by overwhelming  
20 margins), their comparative treatment simply is not a confirmation issue. It is of no consequence that  
21 the Subrogation Wildfire Trust and the Fire Victim Trust—which are established to pay different  
22 classes of claims—are funded with different mixes of currency. At bottom, the Objections arguing  
23 for reclassification are an expression of claimants' displeasure that the Fire Victim Trust is partially  
24 funded with Reorganized HoldCo stock. But this is not a valid objection and, in any event, is obviated  
25 by the fact that the Fire Victims have now voted overwhelmingly to support the Plan with full  
26 disclosure of its terms. Simply put, these objectors should not be allowed to repackage their "no"  
27 vote as an objection to classification and thereby override the will of the supermajority of individual  
28



1 Fire Victims that have voted in favor of the Plan.

2 C. The Made Whole Release is a Permissible, Voluntary Release

3 In its Objection, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel alone argues that  
4 the Plan's Mutual Made Whole Release imposes an impermissible third party release on individual  
5 wildfire victims who will recover from the Fire Victim Trust. *See* Docket No. 7308 ("**Objection of**  
6 **the Church of the Foursquare Gospel**"). That objection should be overruled. Section 4.25(f)(ii)  
7 of the Plan—which incorporates a critical term of the Subrogation Claims RSA—requires that “any  
8 settlement or other agreement with any holder or holders of a Fire Victim Claim that fixes the amount  
9 or terms for satisfaction of such Claim” will be conditioned upon the claimant's execution of the  
10 Mutual Made Whole Release. The Plan includes as Exhibit C the form Mutual Made Whole Release  
11 that was negotiated by the Ad Hoc Subrogation Group, the TCC, and the same counsel for the Fire  
12 Victims who executed the Tort Claimants RSA. Critically, the settlement with the Ad Hoc  
13 Subrogation Group only requires a Mutual Made Whole Release from those Fire Victims that settle  
14 with the Fire Victim Trust. The Court previously considered, and expressed approval for, the Mutual  
15 Made Whole Release when the RSAs were approved, stating at the December 17 hearing that the  
16 Court was “. . . satisfied that the way the RSAs have played out with the releases that they're  
17 permissible under the [sic] both documents.” Dec. 17, 2019 Hr'g Tr. 295:7-25. Accordingly, the  
18 Objection of the Church of the Foursquare Gospel should be overruled.

19 D. Exculpated Parties Need Not Be Limited To Estate Fiduciaries

20 This Court should also overrule the U.S. Trustee's Objection that the Plan's definition  
21 of Exculpated Parties should be limited to estate fiduciaries. It is appropriate for a plan to extend  
22 similar protection to other stakeholder groups that play a key role in the plan negotiations and the  
23 reorganization. Courts in the Ninth Circuit have recognized that exculpation clauses are valuable  
24 tools, particularly in contentious cases, such as these chapter 11 cases. *See In re Fraser's Boiler*  
25 *Serv., Inc.*, 593 B.R. 636, 639 (Bankr. W.D. Wash. 2018). Moreover, plans of reorganization may  
26 provide exculpation to parties beyond estate fiduciaries and their professionals. *See e.g. In re*  
27 *Newzoom Inc.* (Bankr. N.D. Cal.) Case No. 15-31141 (HB) (providing limited exculpation to  
28



creditors). Section 10.8 of the Plan is narrowly tailored and limits the actions Consenting Creditors are exculpated from to actions in these chapter 11 cases (*e.g.* negotiating the Subrogation Claims RSA, Subrogation Wildfire Trust Agreement). Given the historic complexity of these chapter 11 cases and the critical role played by Consenting Creditors, the Plan’s limited exculpation provisions should be approved.

E. The Subrogation Wildfire Trustee Can Interpret Plan Provisions Without Seeking Court Approval

Finally, to the extent there are any Objections with respect to the Subrogation Wildfire Trustee’s ability to interpret provisions of the Plan relating to Subrogation Wildfire Claims or the Subrogation Wildfire Trust, such Objections should be overruled. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. Nos. 7281, 7339. Provision (k) in the Plan’s “Interpretation; Application of Definitions and Rules of Construction” Section gives the Subrogation Wildfire Trustee the ability to interpret certain Plan provisions and the Subrogation Wildfire Trust documents without needing to seek court approval. Notably, (i) no holders of Subrogation Wildfire Claims have objected to this provision, so those objecting lack proper standing to raise the issue, and (ii) Section 11.1(i) of the Plan ensures that the Subrogation Wildfire Trustee could seek Bankruptcy Court guidance to the extent disputes arise relating to the interpretation of the Plan. Giving deference to the Subrogation Wildfire Trustee on matters of interpretation will not prejudice parties that do not hold Subrogation Wildfire Claims, will help limit post-confirmation litigation (and the associated depletion of trust assets available for beneficiaries) and ensure that distributions are made on account of Subrogation Wildfire Claims as quickly as possible.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons and as addressed in the Debtors’ brief in support of confirmation, all objections to confirmation of the Plan should be overruled, and the Plan should be confirmed.

1 Dated: May 22, 2020

2  
3 **WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP**

4  
5 /s/ Benjamin P. McCallen

6 Matthew A. Feldman (*pro hac vice*)

7 Joseph G. Minias (*pro hac vice*)

8 Benjamin P. McCallen (*pro hac vice*)

9 Daniel I. Forman (*pro hac vice*)

10 787 Seventh Avenue

11 New York, NY 10019-6099

12 Telephone: (212) 728-8000

13 Facsimile: (212) 728-8111

14 Email: mfeldman@willkie.com

15 jminias@willkie.com

16 bmccallen@willkie.com

17 dforman@willkie.com

18 **DIEMER & WEI, LLP**

19 Kathryn S. Diemer (#133977)

20 55 S Market Street, Suite 1420

21 San Jose, CA 95113

22 Telephone: (408) 971-6270

23 Facsimile: (408) 971-6271

24 Email: kdiemer@diemerwei.com

25 *Counsel for Ad Hoc Group of Subrogation Claim Holders*